One Leptoquark to unify them? Unification in the light of $(g-2)_\mu$, $R_{D^{(\star)}}$ and R_K anomalies

Oleg Popov* and G A White†
*Department of Physics and Astronomy,
University of California,
Riverside, California 92521, USA
†School of Physics and Astronomy,
Monash University, Victoria 3800, Australia
ARC Centre of Excellence for Particle Physics at the Tera-scale,
Monash University, Victoria 3800 Australia

Leptoquarks have been proposed as a possible explanation of anomalies in $\bar{B} \mapsto D^* \tau \bar{\nu}$ decays, the apparent anomalies in $(g-2)_\mu$ experiments and a violation of lepton universality. We examine if such a proposal is compatible with other motivations of leptoquarks, gauge coupling unification, vacuum stability at least up to the unification scale and radiatively induced neutrino masses in the presence of a discrete symmetry that prevents a tree level see-saw mechanism.

arXiv:1611.04566v1 [hep-ph] 14 Nov 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently there has been a lot of interest in leptoquarks as a possible explanation [1–8] for anomalous B decays observed in BaBar [9, 10], Belle [11] and LHCb [12–14]. Of particular interest to us was the claim that the departure from the standard model prediction for B decay could be linked with two other striking anomalies - an observed violation of lepton universality [15] and the anomalous muon magnetic moment [16] - and that a single leptoquark could explain all three anomalies without substantial fine tuning [4] (aside from of course any mass hierarchies for the Higgs and possibly the leptoquark). Specifically they chose a single $\sim TeV$ scale leptoquark, ϕ, that is a colour triplet and an $\mathrm{SU}(2)_L$ singlet with hyper charge $-1/3$. The correction to the standard model Lagrangian due to the existence of this leptoquark is Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} \ni (D_\mu \phi)^\dagger D^\mu \phi - M_\phi^2 \phi^2 - g_{h\phi} |\Phi|^2 |\phi|^2 \\ + \bar{Q}^c \lambda_L i\tau_2 L \phi^\star + \bar{u}_R^c \lambda_R e_R \phi^\star + \text{h. c.}\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where Φ is the standard model Higgs doublet. Leptoquarks are known to have problems with proton decay and as such it was suggested that this can be avoided through a discrete symmetry where SM leptons and the leptoquark have opposite parity.

Leptoquarks are also of theoretical interest as the tend to appear in various grand unified theories (GUTs). Indeed the particular choice of leptoquark used in ref. [4] appears in E6 GUTs [17, 18]. They have also been proposed as a non-supersymmetric catalyst of gauge coupling unification [19–22] and a cause of neutrino masses via radiative corrections [21, 23–29]. These explanations of the neutrino mass are phenomenologically attractive as unlike the see saw mechanism, these models have predictions at much lower energies.

It is of interest to us whether using these leptoquarks to explain these flavour anomalies is compatible with some of these theoretical motivations and if not what is the minimal extension needed for such compatibility. Specifically we look at gauge coupling unification, vacuum stability and the possibility of neutrino masses. We find first that the the modification to one loop β functions are insufficient to achieve unification. We also find that gauge coupling unification puts contraints on the leptoquark couplings which partly conflict with the constraints on leptoquark coupling given in [4] as they had $\lambda_x^R << \lambda_x^L$ which is generically the opposite condition to what gauge coupling unification requires. One in principle has enough freedom left to achieve gauge coupling unification although this requires some couplings to be brought close to the perturbativity bound. This makes the calculation susceptible to high theoretical error. By contrast, vacuum stability is substantially boosted due to the improved running of the Higgs quartic coupling when the portal coupling is non-negligible. This effect is somewhat cancelled at two loop if the leptoquark couplings are large but not enough to make vacuum stability a problem for the model. Finally, there is no way this particular leptoquark can contribute to the neutrino mass. We explore minimal extensions that do not interfere heavily with the leptoquarks ability to explain the three flavour anomalies, vacuum stability or gauge coupling unification.

The structure of this paper is as follows. In sections II and III we discuss the modification to the running of the gauge coupling constants and the Higgs quartic coupling respectively, thereby discussing the viability of gauge coupling unification and vacuum stability in this model. We then discuss how compatible these constraints are with collider constraints and the need to simultaneously explain violations of lepton universality, anomalies in B decays and the measurement of $(g-2)_\mu$ experiments in section IV. We discuss minimal modifications to achieve neutrino masses aside from the tree level term

* opopo001@ucr.edu
† graham.white@monash.edu

in section V. We conclude in section VI

II. GAUGE COUPLING UNIFICATION

When one examines how the three gauge coupling constants of the standard model run, they come close to intersecting at a high energy scale. It is of course now known that they do not unify without some new physics entering in at a lower scale, typically just above the weak scale. The Leptoquarks change the running of gauge coupling constants and it was first suggested that a weak scale Leptoquark could cause gauge coupling unification to manifest in ref. [19] and as mentioned in the introduction this has become a major motivation and attraction for considering low scale leptoquarks. It is therefore of interest whether this is feasible in a model where a leptoquark is used to simultaneously explain flavour anomalies.

The change in the one loop β functions changes when one extends the standard model by a leptoquark. However, we find that this will not lead to unification. To improve the unification of gauge couplings, the leptoquark couplings λ_L and λ_R effect the beta functions for gauge coupling constants at two loop level as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_{g_1} &\ni \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}\frac{25g_1^3}{6} - \frac{1}{(4\pi)^4}\frac{(30\mathrm{Tr}[\lambda_L\lambda_L^\dagger] + 78\mathrm{Tr}[\lambda_R\lambda_R^\dagger])}{7680\pi^4}g_1^3 \\
\beta_{g_2} &\ni -\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}\frac{19g_2^3}{6} - \frac{1}{(4\pi)^4}\frac{(3\mathrm{Tr}[\lambda_L\lambda_L^\dagger])}{256\pi^4}g_2^3 \\
\beta_{g_3} &\ni -\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}\frac{41g_3^3}{6} - \frac{1}{(4\pi)^4}\frac{(30\mathrm{Tr}[\lambda_L\lambda_L^\dagger] + 15\mathrm{Tr}[\lambda_R\lambda_R^\dagger])}{7680}g_3^3.
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Note that the Higgs portal coupling does not effect the running. The Higgs portal coupling is the major player in achieving a boost to the stability of the vacuum so the two satisfying the two constraints - vacuum stability and gauge coupling unification - are only moderately correlated as we explain in the next section. Typically raising the left handed coupling constants takes one further away from coupling unification whereas raising the right handed coupling gets one closer. If all left handed couplings are null then gauge coupling unification is achieved when

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left[\lambda_R\lambda_R^\dagger\right] \sim 3. \tag{3}$$

This number rises if the left handed leptoquark couplings rises.

If the leptoquark is used to explain the apparent violation of lepton universality, it turns out to be difficult to avoid at least one leptoquark coupling being large, namely the $\lambda^L_{c\mu}$ coupling. This raises the required value of the right handed leptoquark coupings. Fig. 1 shows the running of the gauge couplings for leptoquark couplings chosen to satisfy all phenomenology constraints as well as explaining all three flavour anomalies. We take all standard model couplings at weak scale and use the standard model RGEs defined to two loop to run all parameters from the weak scale to the mass of the leptoquark (which we set to be 1 TeV) using the numerical package SARAH [30]. In principle, there is enough freedom left over from these constraints to achieve gauge coupling unification if some couplings are made sufficiently large. The results however should be taken with a heavy grain of salt because the running of the leptoquark couplings are such that they increase and approach the perturbativity bound. Therefore the calculation is expected to have a high amount of uncertainty. If there are multiple generations of leptoquarks this problem is alleviated.



FIG. 1: Gauge coupling unification($\frac{1}{\alpha}$) achieved via strong right handed leptoquark couplings. With a single generation the couplings get precariously close to the perturbativity bound, a problem accentuated if one wishes to explain a violation in lepton univerality, adding in a great deal of theoretical uncertainty which can be alleviated with extra generations of leptoquarks.

III. VACUUM STABILITY

The recent discovery of a Higgs like Boson at 125 GeV [31, 32] has led to the realization that the standard model vacuum is likely metastable [33–35]. This is because the Higgs quartic coupling becomes negative at large energy scales. This has motivated research on how to improve the stability of the electroweak vacuum through addition to the standard model. There are two ways of getting a boost improve the stability of the vacuum

- improved running through corrections to the standard model RGEs. This has been done numerously in singlet extensions to the standard model [36–40]



FIG. 2: Vacuum stability achieved through improved running of the Higgs quartic coupling due to moderately large portal couplings ($g_{h\phi} = 0.5$). This is compatible with low energy phenomology as well as explaining anomalies in the value of $(g-2)_\mu$, B decays and violation of lepton universality.

- extended scalar sector, for adding a real singlet that acquires a vacuum expectation value. The result can be that the Higgs quartic coupling can be larger than its standard model value [41].

The leptoquark cannot have a vacuum expectation value at zero temperature so the only option is through improved running. To our knowledge this is the first paper to investigate this possibility with leptoquarks. The beta functions for the Higgs quartic coupling will get a correction compared to the standard model which we denote $\delta\lambda_1$ and $\delta\lambda_2$ for one and two loop contributions respectively. The one loop correction to the standard model RGE for the higgs quartic coupling receives contributions from the portal coupling only

$$\frac{\beta_\lambda}{(4\pi)^2} \ni \frac{6}{16\pi^2} g_{H\phi}^2 \ . \tag{4}$$

Note that the one loop correction is positive which makes a boost to stability possible in the first place. So if the portal coupling is large then the leptoquark contributes to improving the stability of the vacuum. The two loop correction can be significant enough to justify a careful analysis. For the sake of simplicity the leptoquark coupling to one generation dominates. This is simply to show the structure of the two loop beta functions more clearly - our numerical calculations consider all generations. We can then write the dominant contribution as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\beta_\lambda}{(4\pi)^4} = \frac{1}{256\pi^4} \\
&\times \Big\{ \frac{6}{5} g_{H\phi} g_1^4 - 30\lambda g_{H\phi}^2 + \frac{16}{5} g_1^2 g_{H\phi}^2 + 64 g_3^2 g_{h\phi}^2 - 24 g_{H\phi}^3 \\
&+ g_{H\phi}^2 \lambda_{L,3}^2 \left(24 + 9\lambda y_b^2 - 12 y_b^4 - 12 y_\tau^4 \right. \\
&\left. + 9\lambda y_t^2 - 24 y_\tau^2 y_t^2 - 12 y_t^4 \right) \\
&+ g_{H\phi}^2 \lambda_{R,3} \left(12 - y_\tau^4 + 9\lambda y_t^2 - 24 y_t^2 y_\tau^2 - 12 y_t^4 \right) \Big\}
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Typically this is strongly negative if the leptoquark couplings are large which drives up the value of $g_{h\phi}$ needed to make the higgs quartic coupling remain non-negative up to the unification scale. To achieve gauge coupling unification with all left handed leptoquark couplings set to zero, right handed leptoquark couplings need to be large. Also, one of the left handed leptoquark coupling constants has to be quite large to explain the violation of lepton universality. This means that several right handed leptoquark couplings have to be quite large to make gauge coupling unification manifest which pushes up the required value of $g_{h\phi}$ to a moderate value. In Fig. **??** we again the numerical package SARAH [30] to run standard model parameters up to the scale of the leptoquark mass (which we choose to be 1 TeV) and then run all parameters including the leptoquark parameters up to the a high scale. For a value of $g_\phi \sim 0.5$ the Higgs quartic coupling never goes negative.

IV. LEPTOQUARKS AND FLAVOUR ANOMALIES

In this section we consider the constraints on the parameter space due to both collider constraints and the proposal to have such a leptoquark explaining the afore mentioned anomalies. All the constraints in this section will be on the leptoquark couplings and its mass. There are no constraints on the portal coupling crucial for boosting the vacuum stability by improving the running of the Higgs quartic coupling. This means that, absent very large leptoquark couplings, vacuum stability is by default compatible with leptoquarks explaining these three anomalies. Let us begin by cataloguing the constraints from the anomalies. The constraints are written in terms of the leptoquark couplings written in the mass basis. To convert from the mass basis to the weak basis we make use of both the CKM matrix and the PMNS matrix as well as the relations

$$\lambda_{ue}^L = U_u^T \lambda_L U_e, \ \lambda_{d\nu}^L = U_d^T \lambda_L, \ \lambda_{ue}^R = V_u^T \lambda_R V_e \tag{6}$$

We will begin with the requirement that the leptoquark provide an explanation for anomalous B decays which gives the following condition on the leptoquark couplings

$$\lambda_{c\tau}^{L*} \lambda_{b\nu_\tau}^L = 3.5 \times 10^{-7} M_\phi^2 \tag{7}$$

$$\lambda_{c\tau}^{R*} \lambda_{b\nu_\tau}^L = -3 \times 10^{-8} M_\phi^2 \tag{8}$$

These constraints cause two left handed couplings to be around 0.6 and the right handed coupling $\lambda^R_{c\tau}$ about 0.05. Since we require the trace of the right handed leptoquark coupling matrix to be significantly larger than the trace of the left handed leptoquark matrix this already constrains the parameter space somewhat. Next we turn to the anomalous measurement of $(g-2)_\mu$. This leads to the condition

$$(1+0.17\ln 10^{-3}M_\phi)\mathrm{Re}(\lambda^R_{c\mu}\lambda^{L*}_{c\mu}) + 20.7(1+1.06\ln 10^{-3}M_\phi)\mathrm{Re}(\lambda^R_{t\mu}\lambda^{L*}_{t\mu}) \approx 8\times 10^{-8}M_\phi^2 \quad (9)$$

This does not put much constraint on the right handed couplings as we can just tune the left handed couplings down. The apparent violation of lepton universality, by contrast, puts the most severe constraint on the parameters as it inevitably leads to some coupling constants being large. Specifically the constraints are

$$\sum_i |\lambda^L_{u_i\mu}|^2 \mathrm{Re}\frac{\sum_j \lambda^L_{b\nu_j}\lambda^{L*}_{s\nu_j}}{V_{tb}V^*_{ts}} - 1.74|\lambda^L_{t\mu}|^2 \approx 1.25\times 10^{-5}M_\phi^2 \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{\sum_j \lambda^L_{b\nu_j}\lambda^{L*}_{s\nu_j}}{V_{tb}V^*_{ts}} \approx (1.87+0.45i)\times 10^{-3}M_\phi \quad (11)$$

The second constraint is straightforward to satisfy because it requires that the sum of a set of left handed couplings must come to the small value of 0.076 which is consistent with gauge coupling unification. Combining this with the first constraint though says that the square of two couplings, $|\lambda_{u\mu}|^2+|\lambda_{c\mu}|^2$ must add to about 6.7. This is obviously impossible to satisfy without making at least one of these couplings very large. It can be more dangerous phenomenologically to have large leptoquark couplings to first generation quarks or leptons, so in reality this will lead to the coupling $|\lambda_{c\mu}|\approx 2.4$ for a leptoquark mass of around a TeV. This puts a very sharp constraint on the ability of this leptoquark to simultaneously give rise to gauge coupling unification and explain the apparent violation of lepton universality. Note that only the violation of lepton univerality requires a condition that conflicts with gauge coupling unification.

Let us next turn our attention to the phenomological constraints. We can get constraints on the leptoquark mass from reference [42]. The lower bound for leptoquarks that decay into bottom quarks is 625 GeV and the lower bound for leptoquarks decaying into muons with a significant branching ratio is 850 GeV. The latter bound is more relevant if one is indeed desiring to explain an observed violation of lepton universality. For convenience we will catalogue all other relevant collider constraints in a single list

$$-1.2\times 10^{-6}M_\phi^2 < \mathrm{Re}\frac{\sum_j \lambda^L_{b\nu_j}\lambda^{L*}_{s\nu_j}}{V_{tb}V^*_{ts}} < 2.25\times 10^{-6}M_\phi^2$$

$$\sqrt{|\lambda^L_{c\mu}|^2|\lambda^R_{u\mu}|^2+|\lambda^L_{u\mu}|^2|\lambda^R_{c\mu}|^2} < 1.2\times 10^{-9}M_\phi^2$$

$$|\lambda^L_{c\mu}\lambda^{L\ *}_{u\mu}+\lambda^R_{c\mu}\lambda^{R\ *}_{u\mu}| < 5.1\times 10^{-8}$$

$$\sqrt{|\lambda^L_{c\mu}|^2+|\lambda^L_{u\mu}|^2} < \frac{3.24\times 10^{-3}M_\phi}{\sqrt{1+0.39\ln 10^{-3}M_\phi}}$$

$$|\lambda^L_{t\mu}| < \frac{1.22\times 10^{-3}M_\phi}{\sqrt{1+0.76\ln 10^{-3}M_\phi}}$$

$$\left[\left|(1+0.17\ln 10^{-3}M_\phi)(\lambda^R_{c\mu}\lambda^{L*}_{c\mu}) + 20.7(1+1.06\ln 10^{-3}M_\phi)(\lambda^R_{t\mu}\lambda^{L*}_{t\mu}) - 0.015\sum_i \lambda^{L*}_{u_i\mu}\lambda^L_{u_i\tau}\right|^2 + (L\leftrightarrow R)\right]^{1/2} < 1.7\times 10^{-8}M_\phi^2 \quad (12)$$

The constraints in the above list are, in order of their appearance

- $B^-\to K^-\nu\bar{\nu}$ and $B^-\to K^{-*}\nu\bar{\nu}$ decays.
- Next two are from the bound on branching ratio of $D^0\to\mu^+\mu^-$.
- Next two are from constraints on the partial width of $Z\to\mu^+\mu^-$.
- Last is a bound on the branching ratio of $\tau\to\mu\gamma$

The constraint from the $B^-\to K^-\nu\bar{\nu}$ and $B^-\to K^{-*}\nu\bar{\nu}$ decays put no constraints on right handed couplings but can be satisfied with arbitrarily small left handed couplings. The constraint from the branching ratio of $D^0\to\mu^+\mu^-$ forces one Λ^R to be small. It is satisfied if the left handed couplings are very small, the right handed couplings if they are equal can be ~ 0.23. Note that lepton universality means that the $\lambda^L_{c\mu}$ coupling has to be ≈ 2.5 which is fine if $\lambda^L_{u\mu}$ is small. The constraints due to the partial width of $Z\to\mu^+\mu^-$ leads to no constraint on the right handed couplings but is satisfied for arbitrarily small left handed couplings. Lepton universality requires that $\lambda^L_{c\mu}$ left handed coupling to be large, ~ 2.5, but this is compatible with the constraint so long as other left handed couplings appearing in the constraint are suppressed which we desire anyway.

The last constraint due to the branching ratio of $\tau\to\mu\gamma$ is the most dangerous if one desires the addition of a TeV scale leptoquark to lead to gauge coupling unification. There is a relative sign in the equation which means in principle that one can find a fine tuned region to the the parameter space where a fortuitous cancellation occurs. But let us concentrate on the non-fine tuned region of parameter space. Recalling that the apparent

violation of lepton universality leads to $\lambda^L_{c\mu} \sim 2.4$, this leads to $\lambda^R_{\mu\nu_i}$ and $\lambda^R_{\tau\nu_i}$ needing to be have a value of approximately ~ 0.08. So we have 7 right handed couplings set to be small in principle. However, a loophole is just to set 3 of them to be very small. To give maximum freedom set right handed $\lambda^R_{c\tau}$, $\lambda^R_{c\mu}$, $\lambda^R_{u\mu}$ to be small as well as $\lambda^R_{t\mu}$. This will satisfy all of the above constraints without significant fine tuning.

V. POSSIBLE EXTENSIONS OF THE LEPTOQUARK MODEL FOR THE NEUTRINO MASS GENERATION

To generate Neutrino mass using the leptoquark model discussed above, we need to go beyond this model and include more fields. Depending on the content added, a neutrino mass can be generated at 1 or 2 loop level. There are several examples in the literature that generate neutrino mass through the use of multiple leptoquarks fields [21, 23–29]. If Dirac Neutrino Mass is generated then potentially additional symmetries, global or gauged, are needed to forbid tree level Neutrino mass generation. Here we briefly discuss 2 extensions of the leptoquark model to generate the effective Majorana neutrino mass at the 1 and 2 loop order through an effective d-5 Weinebrg operator[43] $\frac{LL\nu\nu}{\Lambda}$ with only one leptoquark field in the model.

A. 2 loop Majorana Neutrino Mass



FIG. 3: 2 loop Majorana Neutrino Mass through effective d-5 Weinberg operator.

Generating a Majorana neutrino mass at 2 loop order from the leptoquark model mentioned in the present work requires the addition of extra colored charged scalar multiplets. Figure 3 shows 2 different variants of Majorana neutrino mass with an effective Weinberg operator. In the first diagram, external Higgs fields are coupled symmetrically at the center vertex to the charged scalar line, and another one having one of Higgs field coupled to the leptoquarks at the top vertex and the second Higgs field coupled at the center. Both diagrams require the LQϕ coupling, fields added to complete the loops do not couple to the Leptons and Quarks simultaneously and so do not effect the results of the anomaly calculations done in [4] at the leading order calculations. The first diagram requires the minimal addition of 2 -2/3- charged scalar fields also charged under color (charged diquarks). The charged scalar field coupled to the leptoquarks must be an iso-singlet where as the charged scalar field coupled to SM quark doublets is a triplet under $SU(2)_L$. Lepton number is broken at the soft dim-3 $\phi\phi\chi^*$ term by 2 units. The second diagram of Fig.3 is similar to the first diagram but now χ is a doublet under $SU(2)_L$ and ρ is an-iso triplet as in the first diagram. The Lepton number is broken at the only dim-3 soft term by 2 units.

B. 1 loop Majorana Neutrino Mass through Lepotoquark and d_R mixing



FIG. 4: 1 loop Neutrino Mass Diagram through d quark mixing with effective d-5 Weinberg operator.

Here we briefly discuss another extension of the leptoquark model mentioned above to generate Majorana Neutrino Mass at 1 loop level. Table I shows the field contents of the model. Besides the SM and a leptoquark field, we add 3 generations of heavy vectorlike quark doublets with a hypercharge -5/6 to to complete the loop. The new Lagrangian terms are shown below. To break the Lepton number softly we need the right-handed heavy quark fields to carry 2 units of L number and the Left-handed heavy quark fields to carry no L number.

Particle	$SU(3)_c$	$SU(2)_L$	$U(1)_Y$	Flavour
Q	3	2	1/6	3
d_R^c	3^*	1	+1/3	3
u_R^c	3^*	1	-2/3	3
L	1	2	-1/2	3
e_R^c	1	1	+1	3
$A_{R,L}$	3	2	-5/6	3
H	1	2	1/2	1
ϕ	3	1	-1/3	1

TABLE I: Particle content of the model generating Neutrino mass at 1 loop order.

$$\mathcal{L}^Y_{new,4D} \subset y_1 \overline{Q^c_L} L\phi^* + y_2 \overline{u^c_R} e_R \phi^* + y_3 \overline{A_R} L\phi + y_\epsilon \overline{d_R} A_L H + h.c. \quad (13)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{3D} \subset \mathcal{M}_A \overline{A} A \quad (14)$$

$$V(H,\phi) = -m_1^2 |H|^2 + \frac{\lambda_1}{4} |H|^4 + m_2^2 |\phi|^2 + \frac{\lambda_2}{4} |\phi|^4 + \lambda_3 \left(H^\dagger H\right) |\phi|^2 \quad (15)$$

The y_ϵ Yukawa term is the mixing of SM d type quarks and heavy quarks and required to be small. The effective mass matrix for the d type quark mixing is shown below, where the top left entry is the usual Higgs mass of the SM and the bottom right entry is the invariant mass of the heavy quarks, where as the off-diagonal term is the source of mixing of SM quarks and the heavy quarks.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff mix}} = \overline{\left(d_L \;\; a_L^{-1/3}\right)} \mathcal{M}_{\text{da}} \begin{pmatrix} d_R \\ a_R^{-1/3} \end{pmatrix} + h.c. \quad (16)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{da}} = \begin{pmatrix} y_d \nu & 0 \\ y_\epsilon \nu & M_A \end{pmatrix} \quad (17)$$

The heavy quark searches set limits on the mixing of d-type quarks and the masses of the heavy quarks. leptoquark searches set limits on the leptoquark couplings to LQ and Leptoquark masses. Possible CP violating phases might occur in the 6×6 d-type mass matrix.

VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this work we have considered some of the most intriguing experimental signatures that suggest a departure from standard model physics and attempted to see how a minimal explanation for them fits into the bigger picture of Unification. Improvement in vacuum stability via improved running is straightforward to realize. However, the attempt to explain a violation of lepton universality has some tension with using this leptoquark to achieve gauge coupling unification.

One way or another, we find that new physics is probably needed before the GUT scale. Achieving gauge coupling unification requires pushing leptoquark couplings up such that they are near the perturbativity bound at a high scale and neutrino masses cannot be achieved through this leptoquark alone. Both require additional paricle content (although if a tree level right handed neutrino mass is not forbidden by a discrete symmetry, the usual see-saw mechanism is of course sufficient). The single leptoquark model is insufficient to neutrino masses at any loop level. We proposed some minimal extensions by either introducing some gauge multiplets to generate a Majorana mass at two loops or including a heavy quark doublet with a hyper charge of $-5/6$ to generate such a mass at one loop. The latter is through d type mixing.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Graham White would like to acknowledge that this work was supported by the ARC Center of excellence for Particle Physics at the terra scale (CoePP). We would like to thank Ernest Ma and Peter Athron for helpful discussions and suggestions.

[1] M. Freytsis, Z. Ligeti and J. T. Ruderman, Flavor models for $B^- \to D(*)\tau\nu$, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 054018 (2015).
[2] C. W. Murphy, Vector leptoquarks and the 750 GeV diphoton resonance at the LHC, Phys. Lett. B **757**, 192 (2016).
[3] S. Fajfer and N. Kosnik, Vector leptoquark resolution of RK and RD(*) puzzles, Phys. Lett. B **755**, 270 (2016).
[4] M. Bauer and M. Neubert, Minimal Leptoquark Explanation for the RD(*), RK and $(g-2)_\mu$ anomalies, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 141802 (2016).
[5] I. Dorsner, et. al., Physics of leptoquarks in precision experiments and at particle colliders, [arXiv:1603.04993 [hep-ph]], (2016)
[6] D. Das, et. al., Towards a unified eplanation of RD(*), RK and $(g-2)_\mu$ anomalies in a left-right model with leptoquarks, Phys. Rev. D, **94**, 055034 (2016)
[7] X. Li, Y. Yang, and X. Zhang, Revisiting the one leptoquark solution to the $R(D^{(\ ast)})$ anomalies and its phenomenological implications, [arXiv:1605.09308 [hep-ph]] (2016).
[8] B. Dumont, K. Nishiwaki and R. Watanabe, LHC constraints and prospects for S_1 scalar leptoquark explaining the $\bar{B}$ toD^* tau $\bar{\nu}$ anomaly, Phys. Rev. D, **94** 034001 (2016).
[9] J. P. Lees et al. [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 101802 (2012) [arXiv:1205.5442 [hep-ex]].
[10] J. P. Lees et al. [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **88**, 072012 (2013) [arXiv:1303.0571 [hep-ex]].
[11] M. Huschle et al. [Belle Collaboration], arXiv:1507.03233 [hep-ex].

[12] R. Aaij et al. [LHCb Collaboration], arXiv:1506.08614 [hep-ex].

[13] B. Aubert et al. [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 021801 (2008) [arXiv:0709.1698 [hep-ex]].

[14] A. Bozek et al. [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **82**, 072005 (2010) [arXiv:1005.2302 [hep-ex]].

[15] R. Aaij et al. [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 151601 (2014) [arXiv:1406.6482 [hep-ex]]

[16] M. Davier, A. Hoecker, B. Malaescu and Z. Zhang, Eur. Phys. J. C **71**, 1515 (2011) [Eur. Phys. J. C 72, 1874 (2012)] [arXiv:1010.4180 [hep-ph]].

[17] P. Athron, S. F. King, D. J. Miller, S. Moretti and R. Nevzorov, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 035009 (2009) [arXiv:0904.2169 [hep-ph]].

[18] P. Athron, et. al., Non-standard higgs decays in U (1) extensions of the MSSM, JHEP **2015** 1 (2015).

[19] H. Murayama and T. Yanagida, Viable SU(5) GUT with light leptoquark bosons, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **7** 147 (1992)

[20] J. Hewett and T. G. Rizzo, Much ado about leptoquarks: A Comprehensive analysis, Phys. Rev. D **56** 5709 (1997)

[21] I. Dorsner and P. Fileviez Prez, Unification without supersymmetry: Neutrino mass, proton decay and light leptoquarks, Nucl. Phys. B **723** 53 (2005).

[22] J. Hewett and T. G. Rizzo, Dont stop thinking about leptoquarks: Constructing new models, Phys. Rev. D **58** 055005 (1998).

[23] K. S. Babu and J. Julio, Two-loop neutrino mass generation through leptoquarks, Nucl. Phys. B **841** 130 (2010).

[24] L. Jin, R. Tang, and F. Zhang, A three-loop radiative neutrino mass model with dark matter, Phys. Lett. B **741** 163 (2015).

[25] A. Ahriche, K. L. McDonald S. Nasri, Three-Loop Neutrino Mass Models at Colliders. [arXiv:1505.04320 [hep-ph]] (2015).

[26] F. F. Deppisch, et al., Leptoquark patterns unifying neutrino masses, flavor anomalies and the diphoton excess, [arXiv:1603.07672 [hep-ph]] (2016).

[27] P. F. Prez, et al., Leptoquarks and neutrino masses at the LHC, Nucl. Phys. B **819**, 139 (2009).

[28] U. Mahanta, Neutrino masses and mixing angles from leptoquark interactions, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 073009 (2000).

[29] C. Chua, X. He, and W. Y. P. Hwang, Neutrino mass induced radiatively by supersymmetric leptoquarks, Phys. Lett. B **479** 224 (2000).

[30] F. Staub, SARAH 4: A tool for (not only SUSY) model builders, Comp. Phys. Comm. **185** 1773 (2014).

[31] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 30 (2012).

[32] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 1 (2012).

[33] S. Alekhina, A. Djouadib, and S. Moch, Phys. Lett. B **716**, 214 (2012).

[34] J. Elias-Miro, J. R. Espinosa, G. F. Giudice, G. Isidori, A. Riotto and A. Strumia, [hep-ph/1112.3022]

[35] M. Holthausen, K. S. Lim and M. Lindner, [hep-ph/1112.2415].

[36] M. Gonderinger, Y. Li, H. Patel and M. J. Ramsey-Musolf, JHEP **2010**, 1001 (2010).

[37] O. Lebedev and H. M. Lee, Eur. Phys. J. C **71** 1821 (2011)

[38] M. Kadastik, K. Kannike, A. Racioppi and M. Raidal, [hep-ph/1112.3647];

[39] M. Gonderinger, H. Lim and M. J. Ramsey-Musolf, [hep-ph/1202.1316];

[40] C. -S. Chen and Y. Tang [hep-ph/1202.5717]

[41] J. Elias-Mir, J. R. Espinosa, G. F. Giudice, *et al.* JHEP **2012**, 31 (2012).

[42] [particle data group] (place holder)

[43] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 43, 1566 (1979).